

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 14, 1988

JIM MATTOX ATTORNEY GENERAL

> Honorable Paul Colbert Texas House of Representatives P. O. Box 2910 Austin, Texas 78769

LO-88-107

Dear Representative Colbert:

Thank you for your letter of September 8, 1988. regret that you were unable to brief LO-88-99 before it was issued. It is rare that this office is criticized for working too quickly.

The arguments you raise in your letter do not, however, support a reconsideration of LO-88-99. The goal statutory construction is ascertainment of legi
intent, not the intent of the drafter. 2A N.J. legislative Sutherland Statutory Construction § 48.12. (C. Sands 4th ed. 1985). You state that your individual purpose was to affect a specific facility. The rider, however, mentioned no specific facility. Rather, the plain language of the rider indicates that it is of general applicability. Further, because it is presumed that the legislature intends a result feasible of execution, we must assume that the rider does not apply in a way that creates a requirement that is impossible to fulfill. <u>See Parr v. State</u>, 575 S.W.2d 522 (Tex. Crim. App. 1978).

We also think that any discussion of the proper construction of the rider is ultimately academic. The rider is clearly unconstitutional in that it creates a substantive requirement that is not provided for by general law. We did not address the issue of constitutionality in LO-88-99, however, because it was not raised.

Again, we regret that you were misinformed about the issuance of LO-88-99 and that you were unable to brief the issue beforehand.

Very truly yours,

Rick Gilpin, Chairman

Opinion Committee

RG/SW/bc 4404